



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/929,282

08/15/2001

Finn Wredenhagen

1020457.0012

8113

20575 7590 08/03/2007
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

LE, BRIAN Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/929,282	Applicant(s) WREDENHAGEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian Q. Le	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment and Arguments

1. Applicant's amendment filed June 12, 2007, has been entered and made of record.
2. Applicant's arguments with regard to claims 7-34 have been fully considered, but are not considered persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding claim 7 and 18, the Applicant argues of the lack of motivation or reason to combine Takahashi U.S. Patent No. 6,665,439 ("Takahashi") and Dube et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,782,143 ("Dube"). Thus, the Examiner herein further elaborate on the motivation. As discussed in the Office Actions, Takahashi teaches the determination of edges (column 4, lines 45-50 and column 5, lines 35-44). Dube further teaches an interpolation of image processing for further identifying edges and edge's direction (abstract) of image or enlarging edge's area of image (FIG. 1, element 54, element 56 and "Enlarged Data Image" and column 2, lines 1-45). Thus, modifying Takahashi's method of processing image according to Dube would be able to utilize interpolation to further identify edges and edge's direction of images or further enlarging edge's area of images. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Takahashi according to Dube.

The Examiner believes that all the arguments of the Applicant have been properly addressed and explained. Thus, the rejections of all of the claims are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2624

4. Claims 7-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding independent claims 7 and 18, there is no support found the original specification that discloses the amended limitations "...identifying **occurrences** of a targeted image features in a pixel array ..." and "a feature comparator to populate a match table by matching **occurrences** in the feature table" (emphasis added).

Other dependent claims are rejected because of their dependence to the rejected claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takahashi U.S. Patent No. 6,665,439 and further in view of Dube et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,782,143.

Regarding claim 7, Takahashi teaches an interpolator (column 18, lines 55-60), comprising:

Art Unit: 2624

A feature extractor (extracting outlines of objects/edge) (column 4, lines 45-50) to populate a feature table (populate/generate arrays of numeric values for edge vector) (column 5, lines 33-44) by identifying occurrences of a targeted image feature (generate data of respective color vectors) (FIG. 10, element 10) in a pixel array (pixels) (FIG. 5, element 10), where the targeted image feature is chosen from a group of image features (selection from array of color vectors) (FIG. 5, element 11).

A feature comparator to populate a match table by matching occurrences (compare edge vectors and color vectors) (FIG. 5, element 13 and FIG. 11, element 1004) in the feature table (comparing edges of the modulus edge vector base on RGB color features and tables) (column 5, lines 5-30; column 12, lines 30-36; and column 20, lines 41-59).

Takahashi teaches means for generating a target pixel (abstract). Takahashi does not teach the target pixel is interpolated from the pixel array. Dube teaches an interpolation method (abstract) further generating a target pixel, the target pixel interpolated from the pixel array (column 3, lines 18-22). Modifying Takahashi's method of teaching an interpolator according to Dube would be able to utilize different interpolation techniques in interpolating pixels of the image (FIG. 10). This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Takahashi according to Dube.

For claim 8, Takahashi also teaches the interpolator where the image features comprises an edge (abstract).

Referring to claim 9, Takahashi discloses the interpolator where the feature extractor is adapted to be programmable (extracted features are stored) (column 11, lines 35-45) such that the targeted image feature is changed from a first one of the group of image features to a second

Art Unit: 2624

one of the group of image features (changes/variation of color values of different group of images) (column 9, lines 59-61 and column 12, lines 59-67).

Regarding claim 10, Takahashi also discloses the interpolator where the targeted image feature is adapted to dynamically change according to user preference (a process wherein an operator can adjust/set image features such as hue/saturation/intensity (column 20, lines 54-58; column 23, lines 6-17) such that the targeted image feature is dynamically changed from a first one of the group of image features to a second one of the group of image features (changes/variation of color values of different group of images in corresponding to the position of an edge) (column 9, lines 59-61 and column 12, lines 59-67).

For claim 11, Takahashi shows the interpolator where the feature extractor includes a state machine for each image feature (processing/operating sequences of the machine/apparatus) (FIG. 1, elements 21-24; column 31, lines 34-35; and column 34, line 16) in the group of image features (color vectors) (column 8, lines 1-5).

As to claim 12, Takahashi also shows the interpolator where the feature comparator is adapted to match occurrences in adjacent rows of the pixel array (FIG. 2).

Also to claim 13, Takahashi further shows the interpolator where the feature comparator is adapted to match occurrences in adjacent columns of the pixel array (FIG. 2).

For claim 14, Takahashi teaches the interpolator comprising an alignment controller to align matched image features in the match table (arrange pixels base on RGB values of RGB vectors of the table) (column 12, lines 25-36 and column 20, lines 41-58).

Regarding claim 15, Takahashi shows the interpolator where the alignment controller is adapted to compute relative shifts between adjacent rows or columns (column 13, lines 20-37).

Art Unit: 2624

Referring to claim 16, Takahashi teaches the interpolator where the alignment controller is adapted to identify a transition segment (the changes between edge strength from weak to strong) (FIG. 9A).

Also to claim to 17, Takahashi also teaches the interpolator where the alignment controller is adapted to identify a pivot pixel (centered/strong pixel) (FIG. 9A).

For claim 18, please refer back to claim 1 for further teachings and explanations.

For claims 19-28, please refer back to claims 8-17 respectively for the teachings and explanations.

Regarding claim 29, Takahashi teaches the interpolator where the feature table includes a plurality of pairs of numbers, a first number in the pair defining a start position and second number in the pair defining an intensity for each of the image features identified (a concept of vector set comprises pair of points a_i , c_i , where a is reference to the intensity values of color of image and c is reference to coordinate value/start position) (column 19, line 25 to column 20, line 35).

Referring to claim 30, Takahashi teaches the interpolator where the feature comparator is adapted to match like features in adjacent rows or columns of the feature table (matching in surrounding adjacent pixels or regions) (abstract and FIG. 37, element 72).

For claim 31, Takahashi teaches the interpolator where, after a first row of pixel data (adjacent pixels generate a row of pixel) (FIG. 11, element 1002), the feature comparator is adapted to populated the match table at about the same time as the feature extractor populates the feature table (the continuing processing of updating edge vector while the moduli of the edge vector is matching) (FIG. 11 and column 16, lines 35-67).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 32-34, please refer back to claims 29-31 for further teachings and explanations.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Q. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-7424. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M - 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brian Le', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Brian Le
August 2, 2007